



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND
1777 HARDEE AVENUE SW
FORT MCPHERSON GEORGIA 30330-1062

AFLG-PROA

29 Jan 97

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Contracting Information Letter (CIL) 97-17, Grants Janitorial and Food Service, Inc., Involving Award under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

1. References:

- a. Record of protest dismissal, dated 27 Jan 97, SAB.
- b. AR 210-25, Vending Facility Program for the Blind on Federal Property, 1 Dec 79.
- c. Vending Facility Program for the Blind on Federal Property, DoDD-1124, Vending Facility program for, the Blind on Federal Property, 7 Apr 78.

2. Background.

a. In accordance with the Randolph-Sheppard Act, subsection 107, the operation of vending facilities on federal property, priority shall be given to blind persons licensed by a state agency.

b. Vending facility means automatic vending machines, cafeterias, snack bars, cart services, shelters, counters and such other appropriate auxiliary equipment as the Secretary of Education (office of primary responsibility) may by regulation prescribe as being necessary for the sale of the articles or services. Vending facility does not include food dispensing facilities (e.g., food operations of open messes/military clubs) which engage primarily in full table-service operations.


c. If the state licensing agency submits a proposal and it is within the competitive range established by the KO, the contract will be awarded to the blind vendor. All other offerors in the competitive range are notified of the preference accorded the blind vendor and negotiations on their proposals cease.

AFLG-PROA

SUBJECT: Contracting Information Letter (CIL) 97-17, Grants
Janitorial and Food Service, Inc., Involving Award under the
Randolph-Sheppard Act

3. For additional information, please contact Irene Hamm,
DSN: 367-5632 or e-mail hammi@ftmcpshn-emhl.army.mil.

Encl


BEVERLY Y. THOMAS
Acting Chief, Contracting
Division, DCSL&R
Acting Principal Assistant
Responsible for Contracting

DISTRIBUTION:

COMMANDER,
I CORPS AND FORT LEWIS, P.O. BOX 33931, ATTN: AFZH-DOC
III CORPS AND FORT HOOD, ATTN: AFZF-DOC
XVIII ABN CORPS AND FORT BRAGG, ATTN: AFZA-DC
101ST ABN DIV (AASLT) AND FORT CAMPBELL, ATTN: AFZB-DOC
10TH MTN DIV, FORT DRUM, ATTN: AFZS-DOC
3D INFANTRY DIVISION (MECH) AND FORT STEWART, ATTN: AFZP-DC
ARMY ATLANTA CONTRACTING CENTER, ATTN: AFLG-PRC
FORT BUCHANAN, ATTN: AFZK-DOC-B
FORT CARSON, ATTN: AFZC-DOC
FORT DEVENS, ATTN: AFZD-DOC
FORT DIX, ATTN: AFZT-DOC
FORT INDIANTOWN GAP, ATTN: AFKA-ZQ-DOC
FORT MCCOY, ATTN: AFZR-DOC
FORT RILEY, ATTN: AFZN-DOC
JRTC AND FORT POLK, ATTN: AFZX-DOC
NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AND FORT IRWIN, ATTN: AFZJ-DC

Matter of: Grants Janitorial and Food Service, Inc.

File: B-275157

Date: 27 Jan 97

Todd W. Smyth, Esq., and Louis P. Herns, Esq., Hood Law Firm, for the protester. Maj. Robert L. Duecaster, Department of the Army, for the agency. Stephen K. Simpson, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, Alabama Department of Rehabilitation Services, for the intervenor. C. Douglas McArthur, Esq., and Christine S. Melody, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Under solicitation issued subject to the Randolph-Sheppard Act (establishing priority for the blind in the award of contracts for operation of vending facilities on federal property) which did not require state licensing agency (SLA) for the blind to demonstrate in its offer the extent of its commitment to employing the blind in the performance of the contract, contention that the SLA has not made a firm commitment to ensuring the employment of the blind concerns a matter of contract administration for consideration by the contracting agency and the Department of Education, which is charged with overseeing the SLA's performance and is not for review by the General Accounting Office.

DECISION

Grants Janitorial and Food Service, Inc. protests the award of a contract to the Alabama Department of Rehabilitation Services, a state licensing agency (SLA) for the blind, under request for proposals (RFP) No. DABT02-96-R-0002, for food services at Fort McClellan, Alabama. Grants essentially argues that it was improper to apply an award preference to the SLA's offer without considering whether its proposed operating contractor had made a commitment to employ or assist the blind during performance.

We dismiss the protest.

The RFP called for award of a fixed-price requirements contract for a 1-year fiscal year 1997 base period, with four 1-year option periods. The RFP listed seven evaluation factors, in addition to price. It warned offerors that proposals unrealistically low in price would be deemed reflective of a lack

of competence or a failure to understand the requirements of the statement of work. It also advised offerors that the solicitation was subject to the Randolph-Sheppard Act, 20 U.S.C. § 107 (1994), which establishes a priority for the blind in the award of contracts for operation of vending facilities on federal property; that the agency would establish a competitive range; and that, in accordance with the Act, the Army would award a contract to the SLA without further discussions, if it found the SLA's proposal within that competitive range. Otherwise, the agency would select the lowest-priced, technically acceptable proposal for award.

Of the eight proposals submitted, only those from Grants and the SLA were found technically acceptable. Since the SLA offered a lower price than Grants, the proposal clearly came within the competitive range. Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) § 15.609 (agencies are to include all proposals with a reasonable chance of award in the competitive range). Accordingly, the Army awarded a contract to the SLA. This protest to our Office followed.

The protester made two initial contentions, both of which it eventually abandoned. The first contention concerned the awardee's failure to comply with FAR § 52.219-15, \1 the applicability of which expired in 1993. FAR § 19.508(f). The second was the allegation that the awardee's price was so low for the option periods as to reflect a failure to understand the requirements. At the request of our Office, the agency provided Grants with a copy of the SLA's proposal, under protective order, to allow the protester an opportunity to identify the precise requirements that appeared understaffed. The protester was unable to identify any. Grants' remaining contention is that the agency had a duty to ensure that the successful proposal evidenced a firm commitment to assisting the blind before extending the preference to the SLA. As discussed below, we conclude that the agency had no such duty and that the degree to which the SLA utilizes the blind in performance of the contract is a matter of contract administration which we do not review. Bid Protest Regulations, section 21.5(a), 61 Fed. Reg. 39039, 39045 (1996) (to be codified at 4 C.F.R. § 21.5(a)); Specialty Plastics Prods., Inc., B-237545, Feb. 26, 1990, 90-1 CPD ¶ 228.

The RFP did not require the SLA to describe in its proposal the extent to which the blind would be employed in performance of the contract. Thus there is no legal basis for the protester's contention that the SLA's commitment to assisting the blind should be considered in the evaluation of the SLA's proposal, or that evidence of such a commitment was a prerequisite to application of the award preference to the SLA's proposal. See FAR § 15.608(a); Inner Harbor West Joint Venture, B-249945.3,

Mar. 11, 1993, 93-1 CPD ¶ 232. Rather, ensuring that the contract is performed consistent with the purpose of the Randolph-Sheppard Act is a matter of contract administration. In this regard, the regulations addressing the Army's role under the Act specifically provide that it is the responsibility of the on-site official--that is, contract administration personnel such as a contracting officer's representative--to ensure that the operator is licensed by the SLA and that he utilizes sighted employees "only to the extent reasonably necessary." 32 C.F.R. § 260.3(f) (1996). Further, Department of Education regulations provide for review of the SLA's performance and a suspension of the SLA's designation if it fails to comply with the purposes of the Act. 34 C.F.R. § 395.17 (1996). Thus, there are regulatory procedures in place for overseeing the SLA's compliance, and the SLA risks loss of its status if it does not show such compliance. Absent any solicitation provision requiring a specific commitment to assisting the blind, ensuring that the blind benefit from the award of the Fort McClellan contract is solely the responsibility of the agencies concerned with contract administration and oversight of the SLA's performance.

The protest is dismissed.

Comptroller General of the United States

NOTES

\1 This provision required an offeror certifying itself as an organization for the handicapped to agree that at least 75 percent of the direct labor required in performance of the contract be performed by handicapped individuals.